



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

note on p. 58, to the effect that "there is a good sketch of the 14th cent. literature, by J. V. Leclerc, in the *Hist. litt.* XXIV, 439-455." Over 600 pp. of that volume are devoted to a 'Discours sur l'état des lettres en France au XIVème siècle,' of which the portion cited is only a minor subdivision.

Of the work as a whole it may be said that its style is engaging, its choice and presentation of materials eminently judicious and suggestive, and its entire treatment characterized by enthusiastic and pains-taking study. It is to be hoped that the author's present engagements in the field of Roman History at Cambridge University may not too long retard the continuation of a work so happily begun.

It seems regrettable, by the way, that the happy initiative given by so influential a man of letters as Mr. J. R. Green, in the use of 'Renaissance' for 'Renaissance,' should not have been more gratefully and generally followed by subsequent English writers.

H. A. TODD.

A Handbook of Poetics for students of English Verse. By Francis B. Gummere, Ph. D. Boston; Ginn & Co., 1885. Pp. VI, 250.

In a paper read before the Modern Language Association, Dec., 1884, I mentioned among the helps sorely needed in the teaching of English Literature a concise practical treatise on English Metres. The present work, although not prepared in direct answer to this demand, is a response, in part at least. It is arranged in three parts, treating of the Subject-Matter of poetry, then of Style, lastly of Metre.

The second part, on Style, does not commend itself to me. It is little else than a condensed treatise on Rhetoric, occasionally offering an original conception, but in the main keeping within routine lines. Besides, the special connection between rhetoric and poetry is not obvious. My individual preference is for keeping them as far asunder as possible. The less readily poetry lends itself to rhetorical analysis, the more truly poetical it is. Prof. Minto's *Manual of English Prose* will do for the rhetorical and logical side of our literature all that the most exacting teacher can demand.

The first part, on Subject-Matter, treats of

the several kinds of poetry, i. e., epic, lyric, dramatic. This part gives evidence of the author's wide reading and close thinking. He has carefully worked in a field where I used to like to roam, namely, in the history of literature and literary forms. As a start, his treatise is excellent. But only as a start. It does not give enough to satisfy any one, least of all the earnest teacher. It provokes one by its bare mentionings of authors and books that have played a determining part in the evolution of modern expression. Thus, what good to say that the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius "was the herald of a long line of allegorical poems." The poem merits a full analysis. Again, why not give abstracts of the late Greek prose romances, of the earlier Visions and Wanderings, of the New Testament Apocrypha? My earnest exhortation to the author is to expand his 80 pp. into an independent volume of 800 pp., co-ordinating for us, as best he may, the prime factors in that huge creative impulse which we call mediæval literature.

In the way of detail criticism, I fear that he has overlooked Coleridge's distinction between "fancy" and "imagination." Otherwise he would scarcely have written, p. 17, "As reason waxes, fancy wanes." Substitute imagination for fancy, and the proposition may perhaps pass. But fancy and reason are companions. Whenever the man of reason metamorphoses himself for the nonce into a poet, he is always fanciful. The eighteenth century in England was the age of reason, and its poets—from Pope downward—reveled in fancy. Witness the *Rape of the Lock*.

Concerning the third section, Metre, my only regret is that it does not occupy the entire volume. The author has not space enough to do justice to the subject, or to himself. Thus, two pages are scant allowance to the Sonnet, that pride of the poet and crux of the poetaster. No note is taken of the subtle, but close correspondence between Metre and Mood. A writer in the *Athenæum*, Dec. 5, '85, discussing the objectionable lines "To Mary" in the suppressed Byron quarto of 1806, argues that however faulty they might be, "the boy was in earnest when he wrote them [the first six stanzas]; and he wrote them in a metre which will forever be associated with earnestness—the metre of *In Memoriam*." In view of the

correspondence between Metre and Mood, we can scarcely glide, as suggested p. 238, from the Spenserian stanza to the *ottava rima*, by merely characterizing the latter as simpler and easier-paced. Spenserian stanza is nothing if not dignified, too dignified to be even forced into satire. Whereas *ottava rima* has an innate and well-nigh irresistible tendency that way. Its terminal couplet produces a grotesque, jiggling effect, as one of Byron's critics pointed out long ago, and as Byron himself knew perfectly when he indited *Don Juan*.

Blank verse is handled well and at length. Yet I fail to understand why Wordsworth and Byron should be ignored, and Tennyson put off with a line, p. 199, top. Wordsworth's blank verse is a model of lucid exposition, Byron's of feigned doubt or intense defiance, while Tennyson's is great in many more ways than mere "delicacy of construction." Stedman is quite right in dwelling upon the originality, the strength and condensation, the virility of Tennyson's heroic blank verse, in distinction from his idyllic. The quotation from *Faustus*, p. 227, is awkwardly introduced; the student might easily blunder into assigning it to *Hyperion*.

There are numerous points, some general, some special, that I should like to discuss with the author. For instance, *why* Dryden and his set tried so persistently to force riming couplets on the stage. Was it not because blank verse in the hands of the later Stuart dramatists had become so incoherent in structure as to be undistinguishable from prose?

For the purposes of the present volume too much space is allotted to the Anglo-Saxon and Early English period. Our verse begins for ordinary students with Chaucer. The sporadic remains of alliteration and *Hebungen* can be touched upon lightly in passing. Our students need, first and last, thorough training in the more common forms of verse as they are used by the greatest poets, and to this end everything else should be sacrificed in such a manual.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

### THE ETYMOLOGY OF *inveigle*.

Serenius derives it "from the Germ. *wiegehn*, in *aufwiegehn*: to excite, Swed. *upwiglia*, a frequentative of the M. Goth. *wagian*: to excite,

to move." This is impossible on account of the initial *v*. Ihre, on the contrary thinks that the Swedish word may come from the English: A. S. *wiglian*, to beguile. But Junius and Skinner suggest that *inveigle* may be from the French *aveugle*: blind, *aveugler*: to blind, hoodwink, deprive of sight; hence *inveigle* would mean: to blind the eyes, or, metaphorically, the mind, and thus to mislead, to entice; equivalent to the English expression "to throw dust in the eyes" (Richardson). Müller's Etymologisches Woerterbuch derives our word from the Italian *invogliare*, which means to raise the desire or wish of somebody; "but other words, especially the Fr. *aveugler*, It. *avvolare*, Prov. *avogolar* seem to be mixed up with it." Wedgwood sides with Müller: "it is probably from a false notion of the etymology, that we find it spelt *aveugle*." Palmer's Dictionary of Corrupted Words takes it from the Fr. *aveugler*: "the *in-* was perhaps due to the idea that the word meant: to draw in, to ensnare; perhaps a connection was imagined with *inveigh*—Lat. *invehere*." Webster's and the Imperial Dictionary likewise derive it from the Norm. *enveogler*; Fr. *aveugler*. Skeat would take the word from the same source, if it were not for the spelling.

This derivation certainly looks reasonable enough, as far as the meaning of the word is concerned; the only difficulty would be to account for its form. Many different spellings are cited in the dictionaries, all representing however the tonic vowel as an *i* (Continental) sound. If we can account for this sound, we should consider the derivation from Fr. *aveugle* as established. Lat. *o* tonic gives us in Anglo-Norman *oe* or *eo* (representing perhaps an *o* umlaut); this gives us in Middle-English *e*, later an *i* sound, e. g. Lat. *bōvem* > Norm. *boef* > M. E. *beef*; Lat. *pōpulum* > Norm. *poēple* > M. E. *peple*, *poeple*, *people*; Lat. *prībā're* > A. N. *pruver*, but as a tonic syllable, 3d. pers. plur. *proevent*, > M. E. *prooven*, *preven*, preserved in the compound *reprieve*; Lat. *mōv're* > M. E. *meven*, etc. Therefore from Lat. *\*in-ab-ocul-* are we get by regular change the A. N. *enveogler*, cited in Kelham's Norman Glossary; hence the M. E. *envegler*, the tonic vowel changing according to the regular rotation of English vowel-sounds, into an *i* sound, represented in this word by *ei*. The representation